

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the office action dated March 22, 2006, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,520 to Suzuki. Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a data communication apparatus comprising a drop detecting circuit for detecting a drop in a power supply voltage supplied to the drop detecting circuit itself. With this feature, the detecting circuit can detect a drop in the power supply voltage when the power supply voltage is stopped, and can notify a communication apparatus that the communication is about to stop prior to becoming inoperative so that the communication would be safely stopped.

The Examiner relies on Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art only for the teaching of a data communication apparatus for data communication via cables and relies on Suzuki for the remaining features recited in claim 1. Suzuki is directed to a mobile communication device and a power supply for the mobile communication device. As depicted in Figure 2, Suzuki discloses a battery voltage detecting section 4. The signal line for detecting the power voltage of the battery 3 is connected to the battery voltage detecting section 4. However, Suzuki does not disclose how the power supply voltage for operating the voltage detecting section 4 itself is

supplied to the battery voltage detecting section 4. Thus, Suzuki fails to disclose detecting a drop in a power supply voltage supplied to the drop detecting circuit itself, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP § 2143.03), and the combination of the AAPA and Suzuki fails to do so, it is respectfully submitting that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references taken alone or in combination with one another.

Independent claim 7 recites features similar to those described above in relation to claim 1. As such, claim 7 is patentable over the cited references at least for the same reasons provided for claim 1. Claims 2 – 6 depend from claim 1. Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

III. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No.: 10/715,432

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:dab
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: June 7, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**